BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 IN THE MATTER OF 3 PCHB No. 79-92 WILLIAM A. WEST, 4 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, Appellant, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 5 AND ORDER v. 6 SOUTHWEST AIR POLLUTION) CONTROL AUTHORITY, 7 Respondent.) 8 9

THIS MATTER, the appeal of a \$50 civil penalty for outdoor burning allegedly in violation of respondent's Section 4.01 of Regulation I having come on regularly for formal hearing on the 11th day of October, 1979 in Longview, Washington, and appellant, William A. West appeared representing himself, and respondent, Southwest Air Pollucion Control Authority, appearing through its attorney, James D. Ladlev with William A. Harrison, hearing examiner presiding, and the Board having considered the exhibits, records and files herein and having

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

reviewed the Proposed Order of the presiding officer mailed to the parties on the 24th day of October, 1979, and more than eventy days having elapsed from said service; and

The Board having received no exceptions to said Proposed Order and the Board being fully advised in the premises; NOW THEREFORE,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said Proposed
Order containing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order dated
the 19th day of October, 1979, and incorporated by reference herein
and attached hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as
the Board's Final Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order
herein.

DATED this 2/2 day of November, 1979.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

 $\bigcap_{i} \cdot \bigcap_{j} \cdot \bigcap_{i} \setminus \bigcap_{j} \setminus \cup \bigcap_{j$

CHRIS SMITH, Member

DAVID AKANA, Member

TITAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 2

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, LaRene Barlin, certify that I mailed, postage prepaid, copies of the foregoing document on the day of November, 1979, to each of the following-named parties, at the last known post office addresses, with the proper postage affixed to the respective envelopes:

Mr. James D. Ladley Attorney at Law P. O. Box 938 Vancouver, Washington 98666

Mr. William A. West 608 East 8th Street LaCenter, Washington 98629

Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority 7601-H N.E Hazel Dell Avenue Vancouver, Washington 98665

LaRene Barlin, Adm. Asst.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

S F No 9928-A

• 9

Į

BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 3 IN THE MATTER OF WILLIAM A. WEST, 4 PCHB No. 79-92 Appellant, 5 PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, v. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 6 AND ORDER SOUTHWEST AIR POLLUTION 7 CONTROL AUTHORITY, S Respondent. 9

This matter, the appeal of a \$50 civil penalty for outdoor burning allegedly in violation of respondent's Section 4.01 of Regulation I, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board convened at Longview, Washington on October 11, 1979. Hearing Examiner William A. Harrison presided alone. Respondent elected a formal hearing pursuant to RCW 43.21B.230.

Appellant, William A. West, appeared representing himself.

Respondent appeared by and through its attorney, James D. Ladley.

Reporter Betty Koharski recorded the proceedings.

WWW/dwo

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

Respondent, pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260, has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I containing respondent's regulations and amendments thereto, of which official notice is taken.

ΙI

On the morning of June 4, 1979, appellant William A. West visited respondent's office to lodge a complaint, as he had done for several years, concerning airborne dust from dirt roads near his home in LaCenter. Respondent's Chief of Control discussed the situation with appellant. Unsatisfied, appellant insisted that respondent's inspectors visit his home immediately and vowed to ignite tires in his back yard at 3:30 that afternoon to force the inspectors to core. Respondent's Chief of Control advised appellant not to do that but expressed concern for appellant's complaints.

III

In the afternoon of June 4, 1979, appellant ignited a fire, but one consisting solely of sawn, untreated lumber confined to a burn barrel. Although the fire was used to roast hot dogs, the appellant ignited the fire to attract respondent's investigators and would not have ignited it otherwise. At the request of respondent's Chief of

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

Control investigators arrived at appellant's home at the appointed time, were invited in, inspected the fire and issued a otice of Violation citing respondent's Section 4.01 of Regulation I. Appellant was cooperative and extinguished the fire when requested to do so by the investigator. He had no permit for the fire. A Notice and Order of Civil Penalty was later received by appellant assessing a \$50 civil penalty. From this, appellant appeals.

IV

Appellant has no prior record of any violation of respondent's regulations. He has urged officials of the Town of LaCenter to take action to pave the streets in question.

V

Arv Conclusion of Law hereinafter stated which should be deemed a Finding of Face is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

Respondent's Section 4.01 of Regulation I provides, in pertinent part:

No person shall ignite, cause to be ignited, permit to be ignited, or suffer, allow or maintain any open fire within the jurisdiction of the Authority, except as provided in this Pegulation.

(a) The following fires are excepted from provisions of this regulation:

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

3

5 I 5 n 108 A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

_' -

..-

- (1) Fires set only for recreational purposes and cooking of food for human consumption, provided no nuisance is created.
- (2) ...

ĺ

- (b) Open burning may be done under permit:
 - (1) Application for burning permits shall be on forms provided by the local fire department.
 - (2) ...

(Emphasis added.)

In order to fit within the "recreation" exception of Section 4.01(a)(1) above, the fire must only be for a bona fide recreational purpose and not, as here, for the additional purpose of summoning respondent's inspectors. Appellant is therefore not within the protection afforded by the recreational exception and, having no permit, violated respondent's Section 4.01 of Regulation I.

II

Because the violation committed by appellant is his first offense against respondent's Regulation I, and because his concern was for air pollution control, though his methods were eccentric, the penalty in this ratter should be suspended. The effect of this incident should be to improve each party's understanding of the other, and to result in open, straightforward communication in the future, without resort to any more fires such as this one.

III

Any Finding of Fact which should be deered a Conclusion of Law

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

ß

5.

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW A TO ORDER

Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board issues this ORDER

The \$50 civil penalty is affirmed; provided however, that it is suspended on condition that appellant not violate respondent's outdoor fire regulations for a period of six months from the date of appellant's receipt of this Order.

DONE at Lacey, Washington this

is hereby adopted as such.

day of October, 1979.

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS, BOARD

WILLIAM A. HARRISON Presiding Officer